Volume 19, Nos. 8 & 9 August-September 1991

FOCUS

Strategies for Success in the '90s

Transmitting a Cultural Heritage to Young People and Creating a New College Scholarship Foundation Are Investments Blacks Should Make

Campuses Debate Multiculturalism

Calls for Universities to Expand Their Curriculums to Reflect American Diversity Are Vigorously Resisted by Academic Traditionalists

Were Sanctions Lifted Too Soon?

Whether President Bush Adhered to the Intent of Congress When He Removed Sanctions From South Africa Remains in Question

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

Strategies for Success in the '90s

Transmitting a Cultural Heritage to Young People and Creating a New College Scholarship Foundation Are Investments Blacks Should Make

by Eddie N. Williams

We all know the story: Noah built an ark; all on board survived a rain of 40 days and 40 nights; they later went forth and multiplied with the blessing of God. I am sure this Biblical story has prompted many lessons in several lands and languages. It also has led to what my friend Louis Gerstner, chairman and CEO of R.J.R. Nabisco, calls the "Noah Principle." The Noah Principle says that you don't get points for predicting rain; you only get a reward for building an ark. This is a valuable message for all of us. The long, hard rain of racism constantly challenges us to build new arks for our survival, our success, and our mastery. The challenge is especially acute today because many of the strategies of the past are no longer as effective as they used to be. Furthermore, some of us are spending too much time predicting rain when we should be building arks. To build the right kind of vessel to overcome today's obstacles we need to know the nature of the problems we face, and we need a strategic plan and the will to make it work.

Dealing with racism today requires understanding how our circumstances and the manifestations of racism have changed over the past four decades. After centuries of servitude, segregation, and subjugation, we are resolved that never again will we tolerate the enslavement and destruction of our people. Indeed, blacks have made great strides in winning public office and serving in positions of national leadership. The black middle class has grown impressively, and more and more blacks are appearing in executive suites, in board rooms of major corporations, in the professions, and as business owners.

While much has changed for the better, much remains to be done. For example, the legal structure of segregation has been largely demolished, yet numerous forms of discrimination persist—in housing, employment, education, the judicial system, and in banking and finance. Nearly a third of the black population is held down by a combination of racism and poverty.

In some respects, we black Americans are not responding to the obstacles that confront us as well as we might. At times we overlook our own growing economic resources as a means of addressing urgent problems, relying too much on an increasingly callous and unresponsive federal government. Changing our perception of where we stand in relation to the "system" and developing a full awareness of and confidence in the resources at our disposal may be easier said than done, but it is a challenge we shirk at our peril.

American society has always been ambivalent and sometimes even hypocritical about the role of government in meeting human needs, facilitating social change, or maintaining an equitable opportunity structure. Although the white majority has supported a restrictive view of government's role in these areas, it has consistently benefited from an active, even expansive government role in such areas as the G.I. Bill and federal support for farmers and businesses. The recent debate over the Civil Rights Act is a case in point. Whereas most blacks perceive widespread employment discrimination and believe government action is required to prevent it, many whites believe relatively little discrimination is occurring and, therefore, that government no longer has a major role to play.

A Joint Center national opinion survey conducted in September 1990 among black and white Americans documents these sharply differing perceptions. The two popu-

FOCUS
Copyright © 1991 Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, Inc.® The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies,** 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPES, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
VICE PRESIDENT, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
VICE PRESIDENT, FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
VICE PRESIDENT, RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS/Nancy Stella

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Odessa Maria Archibald
PRODUCTION MANAGER/Tyra Wright
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Merlinda Ceniza Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Chair*
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum, *Vice Chair*
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia, *Treasurer*
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, *President*
Norma Ketay Asnes/Ketay Asnes Productions
Hannah D. Atkins/University of Central Oklahoma
George L. Brown/Lipsen, Whitten & Diamond
Julian C. Dixon/U.S. House of Representatives
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Wendell Freeland/Freeland & Kronz
Ira C. Herbert/Coca-Cola North America
Elsie H. Hillman/Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Hector M. Hyacinthe/ Packard Frank Businesss and Corporate Interiors
Vernon E. Jordan, Jr./Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld
Bertram M. Lee, Sr./BML Associates, Inc.
Robert M. McGlotten/AFL-CIO
Richard H. Newhouse/Esquire, Chicago, Illinois
Lois D. Rice/Brookings Institution
Sharon Percy Rockefeller/WETA-TV/FM
Pauline A. Schneider/Hunton & Williams
LeBaron Taylor/Sony Music Entertainment, Inc
Felker W. Ward, Jr./Ward and Associates, Inc.

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Louis E. Martin, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/*Secretary to the Board*

lations were asked to evaluate race relations in their communities. About two-thirds of whites thought race relations were excellent or good and one-third thought they were fair to poor. Blacks' opinions were exactly the reverse: only one-third thought race relations were excellent or good while two-thirds rated them as fair to poor.

Today many blacks continue to rely on government to spur further progress toward equal opportunity and to improve their socioeconomic circumstances. The Reagan and Bush administrations have opposed them at nearly every turn although most Americans agree there is no substitute for the role that government has played and should play. At the same time, there are areas where government will not or should not act and where individuals and communities have the major responsibility.

Many effective self-help initiatives are already offered through the National Urban League, the work of the Coalition of One Hundred Black Women, Gideon's 300, Concerned Black Men, Project 2000, and countless mentoring, tutoring and other volunteer efforts around the country. In these and other efforts we must put our money and our labor where our hopes and aspirations are by providing the resources to replicate and expand such programs.

Blacks must accept the challenge of stretching their financial giving where it makes good sense. The resources exist in the black community to support a variety of philanthropic endeavors. More than a third of all black families now earn over $35,000 a year, and the black middle class continues to grow. By the year 2000 the gross income of black Americans will be over $380 billion. In today's dollars this is equivalent to the gross national product of the ninth largest nation on earth.

Two areas, among many, might be mentioned where the investment of our own dollars makes eminently good sense. One is an overwhelming need to transmit the richness of our traditions and culture to our young people and to offer them a view of the world in which their dreams and their deeds are central to the drama of history. By building on our own institutions—the black church, historically black colleges, and an extraordinary array of civic and service organizations—black Americans can and should establish their own network of cultural centers to serve our young people.

Black cultural centers could be funded, staffed, and administered by black people for black people, functioning after school and on weekends. These cultural centers could address crucial questions like: Who are we as a people? What are the sources of our pride? What initiatives can we take to improve our social and economic condition? How can we resolve the fundamental dilemmas that confront us? What achievements should be celebrated? And what bridges can we build between our community and other communities?

A second, equally important need is financial aid to help more young people attend college. Low and moderate income families, from every racial and ethnic group, are having a harder time affording the rising costs of college. For the past 10 years, there have been drastic cutbacks in financial aid by the federal government and by colleges themselves. Given the state of the national economy, the mood of the country, and the shortsightedness of the current administration, the prospects are not encouraging for a change in federal policies on assisting needy students of any color. Meanwhile, declining black college enrollments, due in large measure to a shortage of funds, could spell disaster for the black community.

The national black leadership should create a nonprofit foundation to raise funds, mainly or at least initially from the black community, to provide financial assistance to needy black students who wish to complete their college education. This foundation would supplement, not supplant, the many worthy organizations that provide valuable assistance to college students. It would certainly not compete with the United Negro College Fund, which supports 41 historically black colleges. The reality is that some 83 percent of black college students attend predominantly white institutions. This new foundation would be a major national enterprise devoted exclusively to raising substantial dollars, identifying promising and needy students, and working with both black and white colleges and universities to administer grant-in-aid funds to deserving applicants. The foundation would also provide information on how students can finance their college educations.

In these endeavors, partnerships with government and coalitions with other groups would be welcome. Those who preceded us challenged us to aim high; to set exemplary standards of service and accomplishment for ourselves; to send a message of hope to our young people; to reach out to those less fortunate in our own community; to build new arks that will enable us not merely to survive but to prosper. In so doing, we will pass along a better world to our children and our children's children. ■

Sixth National Conference of Black Elected Officials Convenes in January

The Sixth National Policy Institute (SNPI)—the quadrennial conference of black elected officials—will convene in Washington, D.C., January 22-25, 1992, at the Washington Hilton. The Institute is the only national forum that brings together black elected and appointed officials from all levels of governance to focus on policy issues of particular importance to African-Americans. Occurring in advance of the 1992 presidential primaries, it will serve as a symposium for discussing the opportunities and obstacles facing black Americans today and for advancing an agenda that addresses their concerns.

SNPI co-sponsors are: Congressional Black Caucus; Judicial Council of the National Bar Association; National Association of Black County Officials; National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials; National Black Caucus of State Legislators; National Caucus of Black School Board Members; National Conference of Black Mayors; and the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.

For further information contact Rena Jarrett, Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 1301 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20004, or call (202) 626-3500.

Campuses Debate Multiculturalism

Calls for Universities to Expand Their Curriculums to Reflect American Diversity Are Vigorously Resisted by Academic Traditionalists

by John L. Jackson

In a lecture at the conservative Heritage Foundation this September, William Bennett, former Reagan administration education secretary, said: "Instead of being in the back of the bus, they [black students] are told to go to the back of the water buffalo and study 14th and 15th century African history—for what purpose God only knows. There's no evidence that this will help them or improve their motivation."

Positions like this one are common among traditionalist professors and student groups who are resisting calls by minorities and women for more diversity in university curriculums. Organizations such as the National Association of Scholars, Accuracy in Academia, and a string of conservative student newspapers are manning the ramparts of academic institutions to repel what minority scholars call multiculturalism and conservatives call "political correctness" (PC). The traditionalists contend that American institutions have their origins in European or "Western" thought, and that this is most faithfully represented in what is referred to as "The Canon"—the works of such Western thinkers as Plato, Locke, Shakespeare, and Milton. The curriculums at American universities must, they argue, be grounded in these works.

On the other side of the argument, some minority, female, and liberal scholars take the position that America is a multicultural society and that the traditional or Eurocentric perspective fails to take that into account. Thus multiculturalists advocate greater incorporation of such disciplines as African, Latin American, Asian, and Native American history, Third World anthropology, and women's studies into courses of study. In an article for the *Journal of Negro Education*, Molefi Asante, chairman of the African American Studies Department at Temple University, states that "By seeing themselves as the subjects rather than the objects of education . . . African Americans can see themselves not merely as seekers of knowledge but as integral participants in it."

Volume Over Substance

Universities are usually thought of as places where debate is encouraged and the right to question one another's viewpoint is guaranteed. Out of this crucible of intellectual discourse, the truth should emerge. Unfortunately, this model of reasoned dialogue does not well describe how the current debate over academic content is being conducted on some of the nation's campuses. Many exchanges between multiculturalists and traditionalists are shrill, emotionally charged arguments where issues are drowned out by the volume of recriminations.

Conservatives recount the horrors of PC "ideologues" bent on "indoctrinating" students with their "dissident opinions," citing as their proof how former U.N. ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick was shouted down from a podium at the University of California at Berkeley for defending the foreign policy of the Reagan administration or how two Tufts University students chained themselves to their seats to protest a speech by conservative writer Dinesh D'Souza, a research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington and author of the recent book, *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*.

Traditionalists have branded multiculturalist protesters as "political imperialists" for their confrontational behavior aimed at those with opposing viewpoints. D'Souza often serves up repeated anecdotes of PC excesses as the meat of his lectures. Using the bully pulpit of the White House, President Bush has entered the debate on the side of such traditionalists. In his commencement speech at the University of Michigan this May, Bush said, "In their own Orwellian way, crusades that demand correct behavior crush diversity in the name of diversity."

When President Bush named Carol Iannone, an adjunct professor at New York University (NYU), to fill a vacancy at the National Endowment for the Humanities' (NEH) council in January, her nomination became the center of controversy. The council advises the NEH chairman on the award of grants to support research, education, and public programs in the humanities. Iannone teaches at NYU's Gallatin Division which has been organized around the study of "Great Books," the classical works of Western thinkers. She is also a vice president of the National Association of Scholars, an organization dedicated to promoting the "Western intellectual heritage" at universities.

The controversy revolves around Iannone's remarks that in the last few years, black writers have been awarded coveted literary honors like the Pulitzer Prize not based on the merit of their work but as "reparations" to appease the black literary community. When the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee voted to block her confirmation to the NEH in July, Endowment chair Lynne Cheney complained that Iannone was opposed by committee liberals who saw her views as politically "incorrect."

Senators who voted against Iannone protest that their

(Continued on page 5)

Mr. Jackson, an intern at the Joint Center, is a junior at Howard University in Washington, D.C.

August-September 1991

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue:

- Race is a major factor in determining who gets the death penalty in Georgia, according to a recent study.
- William Gray resigns from Congress to head United Negro College Fund and Philadelphia politicians emerge to run for his House seat.
- Atlanta Congressman John Lewis is appointed to House Democratic Leadership.
- Black environmentalists to convene a summit in Washington, D.C., to focus on waste dumps and chemical plants in their communities.
- Across the Nation: Birmingham mayor Richard Arrington faces two black opponents; California's only black supreme court justice retires; Robert Brown is elected to the Georgia State Senate; and Mayor Kurk Schmoke wins the Democratic primary in reelection bid.

Death by Reason of Color

A report on capital sentencing in the Chattahoochee judicial district in southwest Georgia charges that race is a decisive factor in determining who receives the death penalty, especially if the victim is white and the defendant is black. The Death Penalty Information Center's report, *The Buckle of the Death Belt: The Death Penalty in Microcosm,* says that black defendants accused of killing whites are often tried by an all-white judicial process—white attorneys, white judges, and white juries—which virtually guarantees the death sentence when homicide victimes are white. Prosecutors use peremptory challenges (juror striking) to achieve majority-white or all-white juries. Moreover, poor blacks accused of capital crimes are frequently assigned inexperienced and underpaid court-appointed attorneys to defend them.

The report says that the impact of the judicial process in the Chattahoochee judicial district has yielded the following statistics since 1976, when the Supreme Court reinstated the death penalty: blacks comprised 65 percent of homicide victims, but only 15 percent of the capital trials were for black-victim cases; district attorneys sought the death penalty 39 percent of the time when the defendant was black and the victim white, 32 percent when both defendant and victim were white, 6 percent when both were black, and *never* when the defendant was white and the victim black; the death penalty was sought in 48 percent of the cases where the victim was a white female, 9.4 percent when the victim was a black female, and 3 percent when the victim was a black male. The disparities documented in Georgia are of special significance in that, since 1976, three quarters of the executions (113) have taken place in five Southern states: Texas (40), Florida (27), Louisiana (20), Georgia (14), and Virginia (12).

Two bills pending in Congress, the Fairness in Death Sentencing Act sponsored by Rep. **DON EDWARDS** (D-Calif.) and the Racial Justice Act sponsored by Sen. **EDWARD KENNEDY**, were drafted to address the issue of racial disparity in death sentencing. The legislation would allow capital defendants to submit statistical evidence to illustrate that death sentences have been imposed with disproportionate frequency against convicts of one race or as punishment for crimes against victims of one race. The bills are a response to a 1987 Supreme Court decision—*McCleskey* v. *Kemp*—which held that statistical evidence of racial disparity is not sufficient to prove violations of the Eighth Amendment (cruel and unusual punishment) or of the Fourteenth Amendment (equal protection under the law). For the past four years, both bills have failed to get beyond committee consideration.

MICHAEL KROLL, executive director of the Death Penalty Information Center, asserts that at least two things must be done to "minimize the pernicious effects of race and class in death penalty litigation." Congress must approve the Fairness in Death Sentencing legislation and the country's judicial system must appoint competent and

adequately compensated legal counsel to capitally charged defendants. "Competent legal counsel should be the right of everyone facing a capital trial, the most complex of all criminal procedures. To provide less is to perpetuate a national disgrace."

From Gray to White in Philly?

On June 20, seven-term Pennsylvania Rep. **WILLIAM H. GRAY III** announced his resignation from Congress, effective September 11, to accept the position of president of the United Negro College Fund (UNCF). In doing so, Gray vacates his post as majority whip, which made him the third-highest ranking Democrat in the House. Gray's resignation has generated speculation about who will succeed him as representative of Pennsylvania's 2nd District, located mainly in North Philadelphia.

In considering whether to take the UNCF position, Gray said, "I had a choice of having an impact on a million black college students over the next 10 years or waiting around to be speaker." Gray also said the move would enable him to spend more quality time with his family, and with the congregation of Philadelphia's Bright Hope Baptist Church, which he pastors. As whip, Gray will be replaced by **DAVID BONIOR** (D-Mich.), currently the chief deputy whip, who defeated Democratic Caucus chair **STENY HOYER** (D-Md.) in a July 11 election among House Democrats. Bonior was one of the two opponents Gray had defeated in his 1989 bid for the majority whip position.

Gray's September exit comes too late for the state to hold a special election this fall to replace him as representative of Pennsylvania's 2nd District. Therefore, the selection of a successor won't take place at least until next spring. So far, the only sure candidate is black state secretary for welfare **JOHN WHITE, JR.**, who has resigned his post to run for Congress. Other black Democrats who have shown an interest in the seat include: former Philadelphia City Council member **LUCIEN BLACKWELL**, a political adversary of Gray's whose mayoral aspirations were snuffed out in the May primary; state senator **CHAKA FATTAH**; and former secretary of state **C. DELORES TUCKER**, who is currently chair of the Black Caucus of the Democratic National Committee. Philadelphia mayor **W. WILSON GOODE**, whose term of office expires this year, initially indicated an interest in the seat, but backed off after receiving negative feedback about his chances.

During his 13 years on Capitol Hill, Gray rose quickly to positions of influence and leadership. He served as chairman of the powerful Budget Committee from 1985 to 1989 and was elected to chair the House Democratic Caucus in early 1989. In June, he was elected to the position of whip—the speaker's chief vote getter—beating out colleagues Bonior and **BERYL ANTHONY** (D-Ark.). Gray also chaired the Democratic Party's Platform Committee during the 1988 presidential convention.

Higher education has certainly not been uncharted territory for Gray. Before he became a congressman, he taught theology for 12 years at St. Peter's College, Jersey City State College, Rutgers University, and Montclair State College. As head of the UNCF, Gray will be in charge of one of the nation's largest black fundraising organizations. The Fund provides financial support for 41 private, four-year historically black colleges and universities which take credit for graduating more than one-third of all black Americans with bachelor's degrees. Founded by the late Tuskegee University president Frederick D. Patterson, the UNCF has raised more than $500 million in its 47-year history. Money raised by the Fund helps the member schools maintain low tuition, award scholarships and financial aid to students, expand curriculum, and defray operating costs. Gray plans to raise $250 million for institutional endowments over the next three years and $60 to $100 million to be divided among the institutions for operating funds.

Congressman John Lewis Tapped for House Leadership

In July House speaker **THOMAS FOLEY** appointed Georgia Democratic congressman and veteran civil rights activist **JOHN LEWIS** to be one of three chief deputy whips in the House leadership. The deputy whip positions were newly created by the speaker in an effort to make the House leadership better reflect the diversity of the body. With the announced resignation of majority whip William Gray (D-Pa.) in June, members of the House Women's, Hispanic, and Black caucuses lobbied Foley for representation in the leadership. Southern conservatives had also complained about being locked out of top posts in the House.

Foley obliged by appointing Lewis, Connecticut Rep. **BARBARA KENNELLY**, and conservative Democrat **BUTLER DERRICK** of South Carolina as chief deputy whips. Majority leader **RICHARD GEPHARDT** of Missouri said the appointments represent a "message from the Democratic Party to the American people that the Democratic Party represents the wide diversity and breadth of our country." Previously the House leadership had included one position of deputy whip, held by Michigan Democrat David Bonior who was elected in July to replace Gray as majority whip. In their new positions, Lewis and his two counterparts are to assist Bonior in lobbying for the legislative agenda forwarded by the Democratic leadership.

According to **BRUCE RAGSDALE**, associate House historian, the term "whip" is derived from an 18th century British fox hunting term that meant "to keep the pack together," and the House whip system is patterned after one used in the British Parliament. It was formally established in Congress in 1899 and has expanded significantly in the past 20 years to include assistant and regional whips.

Since his tenure on Capitol Hill began in 1987 Lewis, who represents Georgia's 5th district (which primarily encompasses Atlanta), has often been in the spotlight. It appears that the Democratic Party is grooming him for bigger and better things. This year Foley appointed Lewis to a seat on the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, considered a plum position because the committee's main responsibility is determining other committee assignments. Says Professor **RONALD WALTERS**, political analyst and chairman of the political science department at Howard University, "You bet he is being groomed. John Lewis is recognized for his integrity and for being a hard worker, and these are highly desirable characteristics for party leaders."

Environmental Racism Target of National Summit

The Commission for Racial Justice of the United Church of Christ, a civil rights advocacy organization, will convene the first National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit from October 24 to 27 in Washington, D.C. According to its organizers, the summit will develop a plan of action to include the concerns of minorities on the national environmental public policy agenda.

CHARLES LEE, a summit organizer and director of research for the commission, says, "There needs to be inclusion of the concerns of persons of color in the national environment agenda, which currently caters to issues like conservation—a priority among middle-class and affluent whites." He said minorities are concerned about the increasing frequency with which their communities are selected for toxic waste disposal sites and chemical plants that produce industrial and pesticide pollution. The commission contends that three out of five African-Americans and Hispanic Americans live in a community with one or more hazardous waste sites and that minorities suffer serious health problems like cancer, lung disease, and birth defects from exposure to environmental pollutants.

The summit is designed as a forum for dialogue between minority leaders and the heads of national environmental organizations, and to offer grassroots minority organizations a chance to focus on environmental policy at the federal, state, and municipal levels. Representatives from the academic, scientific, philanthropic, civil rights, government, and corporate communities are expected to participate.

The commission has examined the issue of environmental racism for several years. In 1987, it published "Toxic Wastes and Race in the United States: A National Report on the Racial and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Communities with Hazardous Waste Sites." Among the report's many findings was that race was the most significant variable in differentiating between communities with nearby hazardous waste sites and other communities.

Summit organizers say the three-day series of meetings is vitally important to minorities because they bear a disproportionate burden of the environmental problems in the country. Minority environmentalists point to the dearth of minorities in major groups like Greenpeace, the Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, and the National Wildlife Federation as evidence that minorities are being excluded from a substantive role in the public policy debate on the environment.

BENJAMIN CHAVIS, JR., executive director of the commission, says, "The evidence clearly shows that it's African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans who are disproportionately living with toxic pollution in their backyards. Our future is at stake. It's precisely because industry doesn't put toxic waste dumps in Beverly Hills that we must insist on being a part of the policy debate."

Across the Nation

ALABAMA: Three black candidates, Municipal Judge **EMORY ANTHONY**, businessmen **RICHARD FINLEY**, and **JOHN C. HAWKINS**, are challenging three-term Democratic Birmingham mayor **RICHARD ARRINGTON, JR.**, for his seat. The candidates will face-off on October 8 in a non-partisan election.

A newcomer to elected politics, Anthony, 39, was appointed municipal judge in 1983 by the city council after serving several years as county prosecutor in the district attorney's office for Jefferson County. His campaign slogan is "It is time for a change" in Birmingham, but he says his campaign is not against the mayor. Focusing on crime, Anthony cites the city's growing murder rate—more than 100 cases this year according to the city police department. He charges that the rise in crime jeopardizes public safety and the business environment of the community. Consequently, he has developed a crime package that calls for a larger police force, an expanded narcotics unit, and partnership programs with the police and the community aimed at keeping youth out of trouble and identifying known drug dealers and drug houses.

In addition to crime, education and economic development are the priority issues of candidate Finley, 41, president of the Alabama Republican Council and a marketing and business consultant. He says the best way to attack the roots of the crime problem--poor education and despair—is for the city to implement programs like an "earn-learn" program where low-income students earn coupons with a monetary value for each book they read and for the Chamber of Commerce to provide employment opportunities for teenagers. "To fight crime we must stem its growth and to do that we must allow our children to dream and imagine better opportunities and a better community," Finley says. He has never held elective office but he challenged Arrington in 1987 when he received only 669 votes. The mayor's other challenger, John Hawkins, a 43-year-old member of the Socialist Workers Party, also challenged Arrington in 1987, but finished last with a mere 146 votes. Hawkins said he is concerned with social issues like labor and women's rights, health, and support for the Cuban revolution.

Arrington's challengers are considered by local observers to be token opposition and it is expected that he will not have a difficult time retaining his office. Since taking the reins in 1979, he is credited with boosting the city's economy by revitalizing downtown Birmingham and attracting new business to the city. He has supported minority firms by awarding them more than $100 million in city contracts and he is also credited with improving relations between the police department and the black community.

CALIFORNIA: **ALLEN E. BROUSSARD**, the lone black jurist on the seven person state supreme court and its most liberal member, retired on August 30. Despite Broussard's urging that he be succeeded by a black jurist, Republican Governor **PETE WILSON** appointed white judge **RONALD GEORGE** to the post. George has been a judge at many levels of the California judicial system for 19 years and last served on the state court of appeal in Los Angeles. Broussard, 62, was appointed to the state high court in 1981 by former Democratic Governor **EDMUND G. BROWN, JR**. Prior to that appointment he served on the Alameda County Superior Court and the Oakland-Piedmont Municipal Court. Broussard was the second black to serve on the supreme court. He replaced the court's first black judge **WILEY W. M. MANUEL**, who was also appointed by Brown and served almost four years before he died in January of 1981. Since the late 1980s the state supreme court has shifted to a strong conservative majority.

GEORGIA: On August 6, **ROBERT BROWN**, 41, a black community activist of Macon and partner in the real estate firm of Brown and Billingslea was elected to the Georgia state senate. A former member of the Bibb County School Board, Brown, a Democrat, capped the lead in a five man in the July 16 special election for a seat in a predominantly white state senate seat which encompasses Bibb County. He went on to defeat white former city council member and attorney **ROBERT A.B. REICHERT** in the August 6 run-off. Brown fills the seat vacated by white Democrat **TOMMY OLMSTEAD** who resigned to run for mayor of Macon, a post he won on September 10 defeating the incumbent mayor **LEE ROBINSON** and black former city council member **GERALD HARVEY** who finished second with 21 percent of the vote.

MARYLAND: It was deja vu all over again but better for black Baltimore mayor **KURT SCHMOKE**. Beating opponents he has faced before, he easily won the September 12 Democratic primary in his bid for a second term with a comfortable 59 percent of the vote. Schmoke's closest competitor was **CLARENCE "DU" BURNS**, the black former president of the city council who assumed the post of mayor in 1986 when then mayor and now Maryland governor **WILLIAM DONALD SCHAEFER** stepped down to run for the state's highest office. Schmoke and Burns also faced each other in the primary four years ago. The results of that contest were much closer with Schmoke winning by a narrow margin of about 5,000 votes. Also in the race was white former state's attorney **WILLIAM SWISHER**. Schmoke broke into politics in 1982 by defeating Swisher who was running for reelection. Schmoke's primary victory assures him another four years as mayor in this overwhelmingly Democratic town. His Republican opponent in the November 5 general election is attorney **SAMUEL A. CULOTTA** whom Schmoke also beat four years ago.

Correct

(Continued from page 4)

opposition was based not on her philosophy but on her limited qualifications and modest contributions to scholarship. They charge that Cheney has used the issue as a propaganda vehicle. Sen. Paul Wellstone (D-Minn.), a member of the senate committee and himself a professor of political science for 21 years (most recently at Carleton College) explains that he voted against the nominee because he found she was not "distinguished in her field" as the NEH selection criteria for the council require. The committee subsequently approved, unanimously, two other conservative nominees to the NEH council whom they found met the Endowment's standards.

Who's the Victim?

Professors sympathetic to multiculturalism argue that the label "political correctness" and the repetition of the same handful of stories about "PC radicals" are devices used by the other side to imply that multiculturalists are inserting politics into the discussion and suppressing debate, claiming at the same time that their own motives are not political. According to Katherine Bartlett, professor of law at Duke University, "The term 'political correctness' is simply used by conservatives to pejoratively label opposing views, serving to misrepresent, exaggerate and distort those viewpoints." Catharine Stimpson, dean of the graduate school at Rutgers University, says that multicultural disciplines are caricatured with labels like "victim studies." She questions the veracity of many of the tales of horror coming from traditionalists.

Bartlett says there is no ideological blackjacking of conservatives going on at Duke and no threat to open dialogue but states there is ample evidence to the contrary. First of all, she notes, it is not the traditional courses on Western thought and literature that are being attacked, but rather the women's studies, African American studies, and Native American courses. Moreover, most of Duke's department chairs are white males with traditional ideas about education. In addition, the campus has an active chapter of the National Association of Scholars and conservative students have their own independent newspaper, the *Duke Review*, patterned after the independent *Dartmouth Review* at Dartmouth College.

The *Dartmouth Review* has gained national notoriety for its attacks on blacks, feminists, homosexuals, and activists who support causes like South African liberation and relieving world hunger. The publication has become a model for about 60 conservative student newspapers on other campuses, which are generously supported by conservative foundations.

As Leon Botstein, president of Bard College, observes, "The American academy has always been political—as more women and minorities enter our universities, the politics of the academy are changing. Traditionalist faculty and students are resisting these changes because they feel that their strongly held beliefs are under attack." Stanley Fish who chairs the English Department at Duke compares traditionalist to the Soviet hardliners who initiated the August coup against Mikhail Gorbachev in an attempt to "turn the clock back out of fear of newly empowered voices."

For their part, multiculturalists report having been accosted verbally and even physically by some opponents on campus who have denigrated them with terms like "nigger" and "faggot." Multiculturalists protest that minorities and women are subjected to treatment in classrooms that is not conducive to academic achievement and interferes with the free exchange of ideas. In a *New York Times* column on the problem, Gunther Stent, chairman of Berkeley's Department of Molecular and Cell Biology and Judith Martin, who writes the syndicated Miss Manners column wrote, "Education is impossible without the order that prevents intimidation and mayhem."

Qualified Free Speech

To quell such confrontations and restore civility to campus discourse some universities have adopted speech codes that put abusive language beyond the pale. Law professor Tom Grey, drafter of the Stanford speech code, says, "I am in favor of bans on racial, sexual, and homophobic epithets face-to-face if it is likely that they will evoke a physical reaction and confrontation. We've had the speech code for a year now and it has not stopped debate, the free flow of information on campus, or resulted in academic conformity."

The heat and nastiness that the debate generates at times has posed a dilemma. If some speech can be banned, is the freedom of all speech threatened? Some believe that by curbing verbal harassment by extremists in the traditionalist camp, progressives could be opening a Pandora's box that will work against them in the long run. In the *Wall Street Journal*, Yale University President Benno C. Schmidt, Jr., wrote that universities cannot censor speech, no matter how obnoxious, without truly "violating their justification for existence." In a *Washington Post* op-ed piece, syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer wrote that if students are offended by something said to them on campus they should accept such experiences and learn from them. "If students are offended by what flows from constitutional free speech," he writes, "too bad."

Several scholars, however, suggest that some racist and sexist epithets are like crying "fire" in a crowded theatre. Fish argues that "universities are not places for unchecked freedom of speech. . . They are schools, not radio talk shows. We should not make an abstraction of freedom of speech laws. It is not an unqualified right."

Ironically, in the 1970s, "it was academic conservatives who argued that the life of the mind required a higher standard of civility and respect for the views of others," according to Michael Kinsley, an editor of *The New Republic* magazine, "...and insisted that students who could not agree to such a standard did not belong in the academic community." Kinsley is one of the voices calling for extremists on both sides to curb their excesses and lower the volume. ■

Were Sanctions Lifted Too Soon?

Whether President Bush Adhered to the Intent of Congress When He Removed Sanctions From South Africa Remains in Question

by Walter C. Carrington

A decade-long, intensive struggle spearheaded by TransAfrica, the Congressional Black Caucus, and local anti-apartheid support groups around the country culminated in 1986 in Congress's passage, over a presidential veto, of the first extensive set of economic sanctions against South Africa. This act brought to a close the long period of U.S. support, as expressed through the Reagan policy of "constructive engagement," for the South African government, which awoke to find itself on the wrong side of American public opinion.

State president F. W. de Klerk, at the head of Pretoria's new leadership, responded in part by vowing in 1989 to end apartheid and move towards a non-racial democracy. The first earnest of this resolve came in February 1990 with the release from 27 years of imprisonment of African National Congress (ANC) leader Nelson Mandela. Critics of the sanctions approach quickly hailed the new day in South Africa and began agitating for partial repeal of the legislation to reward the South African government for the steps it was taking.

Their wish was granted on July 10, 1991, when President George Bush lifted the sanctions imposed by the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 (CAAA), citing the progress made by the South African government as sufficient to meet the standards set forth in the legislation. The sanctions had restricted new investments by U.S. corporations in South Africa, banned loans to agencies of the South African government, closed American airports to South African Airways, and forbade a number of imports and exports including the much-traded krugerrand gold coin. Under the CAAA's terms, President Bush was given discretion to terminate the sanctions if he certified that all political prisoners held by the South African government had been released and that three of the other four conditions had been satisfied. He was mandated to end sanctions if he determined that all five of the Act's conditions had been met.

The argument over whether President Bush acted prematurely is really a continuation of the basic debate between the advocates and opponents of sanctions. Those who originally opposed their enactment, including both Reagan and Bush, have since interpreted every action taken by the South African government in its most favorable light, while the proponents of sanctions have examined those same actions through the most skeptical of lenses. In lifting sanctions, President Bush abandoned his usual strict constructionist stance and interpreted the legislation loosely just as anti-apartheid groups insisted on hewing to what they perceived to be the original intent of the framers of the Act.

Mr. Carrington, a consultant on international affairs to the Joint Center, is a former United States ambassador to Senegal.

Did South Africa Meet the Conditions?

A close reading of the CAAA reveals that it is not nearly so flexible as those who would lift sanctions assert nor so restrictive as those who would have sanctions maintained indefinitely contend. The law established five conditions which had to be satisfied before sanctions could be removed, including: the release of political prisoners; repeal of the state of emergency; the unbanning of political parties; the repeal of major apartheid laws; and good faith negotiations with the black majority toward the establishment of a non-racial democracy. To make an informed judgement as to whether South Africa has satisfied the conditions, it is necessary to examine their precise language.

Release of Prisoners. The first and paramount condition was the release from prison of Nelson Mandela and "all persons persecuted for their political beliefs or detained unduly without trial." Most of the debate centered around the question of political prisoners. Bush argued that under the traditional definition, i.e. one imprisoned for political beliefs, a case-by-case assessment by the U.S. embassy in Pretoria had indeed certified that all prisoners of conscience had been set free.

His opponents in the anti-apartheid movement, led by TransAfrica, pointed out that many political prisoners meeting a broader definition agreed upon by both the ANC and the South African government, those arrested for political actions, still remained behind bars. In addition, they argued, thousands of political prisoners remained in the jails of South African "Homelands," reservation-like territories whose independence the United States has never recognized. Whether this crucial condition has been met depends on whose definition of political prisoner is accepted. It is hard to believe that the Congress meant to establish a standard less rigorous than that agreed to by the South African government.

Repeal of the State of Emergency. Condition Two for ending sanctions called for the repeal of "the state of emergency in effect on the date of the enactment of the [CAAA] and the release of all detainees held under such state of

(Continued on next page)

emergency." The state of emergency referred to in the Act was repealed in October of last year. But anti-apartheid groups have argued that through laws enacted before the state of emergency, the government retains draconian powers to jail or ban indefinitely and without trial anyone it chooses. Nevertheless, the existence of these laws was known to Congress in 1986 and it had elected not to make their removal a condition for the discontinuation of sanctions. It is fair to conclude, therefore, that the South African government has met Condition Two of the Act, notwithstanding the fact that its enactment of the Public Safety Act of 1986 might make it easier for Pretoria to reimpose a state of emergency in the future.

Unbanning Political Parties. Condition Three required the government to unban "democratic political parties" and permit "the free exercise by South Africans of all races of the right to form political parties, express political opinions, and otherwise participate in the political process." There can be no doubt about the unbanning of democratic political parties. The de Klerk government even went a step further than the CAAA required and unbanned the Communist Party. However, it is the final clause of the condition—"otherwise participate in the political process"—that is troublesome to the White House's case. If Congress had intended nothing more than allowing political parties to organize, there would have been no need to add that clause. It need not mean "one person, one vote." It must require something more than just being allowed to go through the motions of political activity.

Blacks in South Africa today, apart from organizing parties, remain unable to participate in the political process. Their districts are unrepresented in Parliament. There are no elected officials to whom they can present their grievances because they are still not considered citizens of South Africa. They have no more suffrage rights than they had when the CAAA was passed. They could not vote or stand for elective office outside the black townships then and they cannot now. Until they can, Condition Three cannot be said to have been met.

Repeal of Apartheid Legislation. Condition Four required the repeal of the Group Areas Act (which defined where racial groups may live) and the Population Registration Act (which classified all South Africans by race). Both were repealed in June, so this condition would have been met if that were all it required. But the Act went on to say that South Africa must "institute no other measures with the same purpose." Does legislation passed by many localities to prevent blacks from moving into "white areas" after the Group Area Act's repeal qualify as measures forbidden by the CAAA? Lawyers may differ in interpreting whether Congress intended to bar only actions by the national government or those undertaken by local authorities as well.

The scrapping of the Population Registration Act raises other questions. Its repeal was explicitly crafted by the national government to have immediate effect only upon those born since February 1990. All other South Africans would continue to be categorized as either black, Asian, mixed race (coloured) or white. They were given little more than a promissory note, linking the ending of these compulsory classifications to the adoption of a new constitution.

Blacks still suffer the disabilities attendant to the racial classification they endured before the Act's repeal. Black children remain barred from attending white schools, and black pensioners continue to receive government benefits inferior to those granted to whites. Upon repeal, the South African government promulgated regulations which would keep in place the political institutions and practices established along the racial lines laid down in the Act. These attempts to preserve the status quo until a new constitution is ratified would clearly seem to run up against the CAAA's prohibition that South Africa "institute no other measures with the same purpose" as the Population Registration Act. If Pretoria adheres to the timetable it set, Condition Four cannot be met until a new constitution is in place.

Progress Toward Democracy. Condition Five required that the South African Government "agree to enter into good-faith negotiations with truly representative members of the black majority without preconditions." This condition was thought to have been met since the South African government appeared to be engaged in such negotiations with the ANC at the time President Bush ended the sanctions. However, there have been subsequent revelations that while the talks with the ANC were under way, the South African government was secretly funding Zulu Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi's Inkatha Freedom Party in an effort to undermine the ANC, fuel violence in black townships, and persuade the outside world that Pretoria had substantial black support for its policies.

In addition to those five conditions, Bush was also required under the terms of CAAA to certify that the South African Government had "made substantial progress toward dismantling the system of apartheid and establishing a non-racial democracy." Even if one believes that much has been done to dismantle apartheid, there must also be a showing that, in addition, there has been substantial progress towards democratization. No substantive evidence has been presented by President Bush on this point.

More Psychological Than Economic Boost

While the lifting of sanctions provided a psychological boost to the South African government, Pretoria is not soon likely to see any substantial economic benefits. American companies have shown no great eagerness to rush back in before the volatile political situation stabilizes. Many American states and cities have their own sanctions legislation on the books, forbidding those who would contract with them from doing business with South Africa.

The administration has hinted that it might test these statutes in court, arguing that they infringe upon the prerogative of the federal government to make foreign policy. There is no sign that any of these laws is likely to be repealed in the wake of the lifting of CAAA sanctions, especially since other federal sanctions remain in place, the most important of which precludes the U.S. representative

(Continued on back page)

Sanctions

(Continued from page 7)

to the International Monetary Fund from supporting loans to the Pretoria government. Attacking local laws in court could also be a two-edged sword, since it would give opponents of the President's actions legal standing they now lack to raise in the same court arguments over the lawfulness of the lifting of sanctions.

Legal arguments over the sanctions bill's interpretation aside, even its opponents grudgingly admit it was a significant factor in moving the South African government along the path to ending apartheid. How significant a factor is still disputed. A look at the situation in South Africa before and after its passage greatly bolsters the case of those who contend that CAAA was crucial for persuading the government and its white supporters to hasten progress toward dismantling apartheid. Arguments over whether it weakened or strengthened the economy are beside the point.

What is more significant is that important segments of the South African business community perceived the sanctions to be the first of what could be even harsher measures from the international community. As a result, for the first time, sustained, effective pressure was brought upon the Nationalist Party government by white moderates to abolish apartheid. In 1987 meetings took place, against the wishes of the government, between business leaders and the proscribed African National Congress. Two years later, Nationalist Party leader and state president P.W. Botha was replaced by the more pragmatic F.W. de Klerk. The new president soon discovered that for the first time there was a substantial white constituency for change, one that was greatly influenced by its fear of total isolation from the Western allies who had stood by their country in the past.

The current outlook for passage of new congressional sanctions is bleak, given the threat of a Presidential veto, but anti-apartheid activists are likely to keep the pressure on. They will insist that the State Department give a complete accounting of the evidence on which it based its assessment that all political prisoners have been released. In addition, they will call for a careful monitoring by Congress of the actions of the de Klerk government in light of the revelations of its secret funding of Inkatha.

Inside South Africa, the uncovering of the de Klerk-Buthelezi alliance has resulted in a cabinet shake-up in which the ministers of Defense and Law and Order were demoted. Of greater long-range significance is the blow this episode has dealt to Buthelezi's claim that he is independent of the government which he has sometimes criticized but on whose payroll he remains as Chief Minister of the Kwazulu Homeland. Nelson Mandela and the ANC will feel less compulsion to negotiate with him. Instead, they will intensify their demand for an interim government to handle the transition to democratic rule, insisting that the de Klerk government has shown itself incapable of being both referee and participant. ■

FOCUS is printed on recycled paper.

FOCUS
Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies®
1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

26063
SRI
Acquisitions Editor
Congressional Info Svc Inc
7520 East-West Hwy
Bethesda, MD 20814